



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/786,772

02/25/2004

Ross Bunker

BEAS-01437US1

2871

23910 7590 07/25/2008

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 CALIFORNIA STREET
14TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108

EXAMINER

PHAM, MICHAEL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2167

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/25/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/786,772	Applicant(s) BUNKER ET AL.	
	Examiner MICHAEL D. PHAM	Art Unit 2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 May 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-11, 13-18, 20 and 21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-11, 13-18, and 20-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Detailed Action

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/1/08 has been entered.

Status of claims

2. Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-18, and 20-21 are pending.
3. Claims 5, 12, 19, and 22-28 have been cancelled.

Note

4. The phrase “computer-readable storage medium” is limited to only statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-18, and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 6874143 by Murray et. al. (hereafter Murray).

Claim 1:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

“a user interface;”[col. 6 line 66, user interface. Accordingly, a user interface (user interface)is disclosed]

"a plurality of services, wherein a service includes a public interface that has an implementation and provides access to functionality in an extension."[col. 7 lines 12-13, An EDF, implemented in XML, contains various tags that are associated with various extensions. Col. 7 lines 21-25, EDFs advantageously have an “open schema” which means that third party developers can extend the extension mechanism and include their own extensions by creating their own tags. Col. 7 line 27-29, exemplary predefined XML tags for user interface elements can include tags for feature types such as: tool bars, accelerators, menu items, and themes. Accordingly, a plurality of services (tags), wherein a service includes a public interface that has an implementation (open schema) and provides access to functionality in an extension (feature types such as tool bars, accelerators, menu items and themes)is disclosed.]

“a plurality of extensions to extend an application;”[abstract, various extensions can be developed by third party developers for incorporation into the program or platform. Accordingly, a plurality of extensions (various extensions) to extend an application (incorporation into the program or platform)is disclosed.]

“wherein each one of the plurality of services is associated with an extension in the plurality of extensions;”[col. 7 lines 12-13, an edf, implemented in XML, contains various tags that are associated with various extensions. Accordingly, wherein each one of the plurality of services (tags) is associated with an extension (an edf, implemented in XML, contains various tags) in the plurality of extensions (various extensions) is disclosed.]

“wherein one of the plurality of extensions exposes and consumes services associated with another extension in the plurality of extensions;”[col. 22 lines 45-46, receives all of the EDFs and merges them together and exposes them as a single list. Accordingly, wherein one of the plurality of extensions exposes (exposes) and consumes services (merges) associated with another extension in the plurality of extensions (EDFs).]

“wherein one of the plurality of extensions provides functionality accessible in the user interface; and”[col. 6 lines 64-66, an EDF is an XML file that logically describes an extension. For example, the EDF can describe HTML that makes up a user interface. Accordingly, wherein one of the plurality of extensions (EDF) provides functionality accessible in the user interface (user interface).]

“wherein one of the plurality of services provides access to functionality in one of the plurality of extensions.” [col. 7 lines 11-21, an EDF, implemented in XML, contains various tags that are associated with various extensions. The various tags can correspond to: user interface elements, behaviour/component/objects, store elements, user-defined objects, or anything else that represents a point of extensibility in the application or platform. Accordingly, wherein one of the plurality of services (tags) provides access to functionality in one of the plurality of extensions (EDF).]

Claim 2:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

“One of the plurality of extensions utilizes one of the plurality of services” [col. 7 lines 11-21].

Claim 3:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

“an extension is an interchangeable application building block” [col. 7 lines 25-26, extensions can themselves be extended by other developers].

Claim 4:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

“an extension includes an XML (extensible markup language) description” [col. 6 lines 64-66, EDFs] “and at least one of: 1) a set of classes; and 2) a set of resources” [col. 7 lines 63-64, classes and offline data sources.].

Claim 6:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

“an extension defines handlers” [col. 4 lines 17-19, the use of xml advantageously enables efficient handling of extensions from multiple different extension sources.].

Claim 7:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

“an extension provides functionality to support at least one of: 1) a document type; 2) a user interface action; 3) a file encoding; 4) property settings; and 5) debugging information” [col. 6 lines 65-66, For example the EDF can describe HTML that makes up a user interface.].

Claim 8:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

“providing a user interface to allow user interaction with the application;” [col. 6 line 66, user interface. Accordingly, providing a user interface to allow user interaction with the application (user interface)]

“providing a plurality of extensions to extend the application,” [abstract, various extensions can be developed by third party developers for incorporation into the program or platform. Accordingly, providing a plurality of extensions (various extensions) to extend an application (incorporation into the program or platform).] “wherein the providing permits one of the plurality of extensions to provide functionality accessible in the user interface; and” [col. 6 lines 64-66, an EDF is an XML file that logically describes an extension. For example, the EDF can describe HTML that makes up a user interface. Accordingly, wherein the providing permits one of the plurality of extensions (EDF) provides functionality accessible in the user interface (user interface)is disclosed.]

“providing a plurality of services wherein the providing permits one of the plurality of services to provide access to functionality in one of the plurality of extensions;” [col. 7 lines 11-21, an EDF, implemented in XML, contains various tags that are associated with various extensions. The various tags can correspond to: user interface elements, behaviour/component/objects, store elements, user-defined objects, or anything else that represents a point of extensibility in the application or platform. Accordingly, providing a plurality of services wherein the providing permits one of the plurality of services (tags) to provide access to functionality in one of the plurality of extensions (EDF).]

“wherein a service includes a public interface that has an implementation and provides access to functionality in an extension;” [col. 7 lines 12-13, An EDF, implemented in XML, contains various tags that are associated with various extensions. Col. 7 lines 21-25, EDFs advantageously have an “open schema” which means that third party developers can extend the extension mechanism and include their own extensions by creating their own tags. Col. 7 line 27-29, exemplary predefined XML tags for user interface elements can include tags for feature types such as: tool bars, accelerators, menu items, and themes. Accordingly, wherein a service includes a public interface that has an implementation (open schema) and provides access to functionality in an extension (feature types such as tool bars, accelerators, menu items and themes)is disclosed.]

“wherein each one of the plurality of services is associated with an extension in the plurality of extensions; and” [col. 7 lines 12-13, an edf, implemented in XML, contains various tags that are associated with various extensions. Accordingly, wherein each one of the plurality of services (tags) is associated with an extension (an edf, implemented in XML, contains various tags) in the plurality of extensions (various extensions)is disclosed.]

“wherein one of the plurality of extensions exposes and consumes services associated with another extension in the plurality of extensions.” [col. 22 lines 45-46, receives all of the EDFs and merges them together and exposes them as a single list. Accordingly, wherein one of the plurality of extensions exposes (exposes) and consumes services (merges) associated with another extension in the plurality of extensions (EDFs).]

Claim 9:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

“one of the plurality of extensions utilizes one of the plurality of services.” [col. 7 lines 11-21].

Claim 10:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

“an extension is an interchangeable application building block.” [col. 7 lines 25-26, extensions can themselves be extended by other developers].

Claim 11:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

“an extension includes an XML (extensible markup language) description” [col. 6 lines 64-66, EDFs] “and at least one of: 1) a set of classes; and 2) a set of resources” [col. 7 lines 63-64, classes and offline data sources.].

Claim 13:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

“an extension defines handlers.” [col. 4 lines 17-19, the use of xml advantageously enables efficient handling of extensions from multiple different extension sources.].

Claim 14:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

“an extension provides functionality to support at least one of: 1) a document type; 2) a user interface action; 3) a file encoding; 4) property settings; and 5) debugging information.” [col. 6 lines 65-66, For example the EDF can describe HTML that makes up a user interface.].

Claim 15:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

“provide a user interface to allow user interaction with an application;” [col. 6 line 66, user interface. Accordingly, provide a user interface to allow user interaction with the application (user interface)is disclosed]

“provide a plurality of extensions to extend the application,” [abstract, various extensions can be developed by third party developers for incorporation into the program or platform. Accordingly, provide a plurality of extensions (various extensions) to extend an application (incorporation into the program or platform)is disclosed.] “wherein the providing permits one of the plurality of extensions to provide functionality accessible in the user interface; and” [col. 6 lines 64-66, an EDF is an XML file that logically describes an extension. For example, the EDF can describe HTML that makes up a user interface. Accordingly, wherein the providing permits one of the plurality of extensions (EDF) provides functionality accessible in the user interface (user interface)is disclosed.]

“provide a plurality of services wherein the providing permits one of the plurality of services to provide access to functionality in one of the plurality of extensions;” [col. 7 lines 11-21, an EDF, implemented in XML, contains various tags that are associated with various extensions. The various tags can correspond to: user interface elements, behaviour/component/objects, store elements, user-defined objects, or anything else that represents a point of extensibility in the application or platform. Accordingly, provide a plurality of services (tags) wherein the providing permits one of the plurality of services (tags) to provide access to functionality in one of the plurality of extensions (EDF).]

“wherein a service includes a public interface that has an implementation and provides access to functionality in an extension;” [col. 7 lines 12-13, An EDF, implemented in XML, contains various tags that are associated with various extensions. Col. 7 lines 21-25, EDFs advantageously have an “open schema” which means that third party developers can extend the extension mechanism and include their own extensions by creating their own tags. Col. 7 line 27-29, exemplary predefined XML tags for user interface elements can include tags for feature types such as: tool bars, accelerators, menu items, and themes. Accordingly, wherein a service includes a public interface that has an implementation (open schema) and provides access to functionality in an extension (feature types such as tool bars, accelerators, menu items and themes)is disclosed.]

“wherein each one of the plurality of services is associated with an extension in the plurality of extensions; and” [col. 7 lines 12-13, an edf, implemented in XML, contains various tags that are associated with various extensions. Accordingly, wherein each one of the plurality of services (tags) is associated with an extension (an edf, implemented in XML, contains various tags) in the plurality of extensions (various extensions)is disclosed.]

“wherein one of the plurality of extensions exposes and consumes services associated with another extension in the plurality of extensions.” [col. 22 lines 45-46, receives all of the EDFs and merges them together and exposes them as a single list. Accordingly, wherein one of the plurality of extensions exposes (exposes) and consumes services (merges) associated with another extension in the plurality of extensions (EDFs).]

Claim 16:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

“one of the plurality of extensions utilizes one of the plurality of services.” [col. 7 lines 11-21]

Claim 17:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

“an extension is an interchangeable application building block.” [col. 7 lines 25-26, extensions can themselves be extended by other developers]

Claim 18:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

“an extension includes an XML (extensible markup language) description” [col. 6 lines 64-66, EDFs] “and at least one of: 1) a set of classes; and 2) a set of resources” [col. 7 lines 63-64, classes and offline data sources.].

Claim 20:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

“an extension defines handlers.” [col. 4 lines 17-19, the use of xml advantageously enables efficient handling of extensions from multiple different extension sources.]

Claim 21:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

“an extension provides functionality to support at least one of: 1) a document type; 2) a user interface action; 3) a file encoding; 4) property settings; and 5) debugging information.” [col. 6 lines 65-66, For example the EDF can describe HTML that makes up a user interface.]

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 5/1/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's mainly assert the following (lettered).

A. Applicant's assert that Murray does not disclose "wherein one of the plurality of extensions exposes and consumes services associated with another extension in the plurality of extensions" because there appears to be no mention of an extension that exposes and consumes services associated with another extension. That the EDFHub is a part of the software architecture configured to process multiple EDFs and thus not an extension.

In response, the examiner disagrees that Murray does not disclose "wherein one of the plurality of extensions exposes and consumes services associated with another extension in the plurality of extensions".

First, Murray further discloses col. 23 lines 14-19, the edfs are defined as XML files and the nodes are combined into one single XML list. Step 1804 exposes the combined EDFs. In this particular example, the EDFs are combined into a single XML list that is exposed to other various attachment points which when then further manipulate the data. Therefore, what is occurring is that an EDFs are combined with other EDFs (consumes), and then are exposed as a single XML list (exposed). Accordingly, an EDF (extension) is combined with other EDFs (consumes) and then are exposed (exposed in xml list)

In other words, The EDFhub is an application framework, method, and system that allows one of the plurality of extensions to expose and consume services associated with another extension in the plurality of extensions.

B. That exposing of the individual EDFs into a list does not appear to disclose exposing and consuming the services of an extension. That instead Murray merely disclosed the merging of a list of EDFs, which did not appear to involve any consumption of services associated with an extension.

In response, the examiner disagrees. In consuming a service, EDFs are combined and exposed in an XML list. An example would be if two EDFs are combined, it is interpreted that the first consumes the second or that the second consumes the first. Either way, an EDF is consumed with another EDF as they are combined. The list exposes the combination, and therefore the list discloses exposing and consuming the services of an extension.

Accordingly, the claim limitations are still broad enough to read on the cited reference.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record listed on PTO-892 and not relied, if any, upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Contact Information

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael D. Pham whose telephone number is (571)272-3924.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on 571-272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/M. D. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 2167

/John R. Cottingham/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit
2167